'The United States Third Federal District Court'

Case Number & Judge:

23-1848 C

Title of Document: United_States_Is_The_Defendant (The United States Court Of Federal Claims has jurisdiction over my case because):

- 1.) The court already has jurisdiction and the claim needs no new jurisdictional support; I have used prudential exhaustion at getting the Federal Government to investigate or look into a matter (As shown in the Court Exhibits.) (Happened on Federal Property [Presented again in Court Exhibit 'N'] so it's a Diversity Jurisdiction allowed in the Federal Court Of Claims because the United States is being sued.)
- 2.) The court has jurisdiction under the Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1491, using Todd v. United States, 386 F.3d 1091, 1095 (Fed. Cir. 2004) because there is money damage recovery requests which grants jurisdiction over claims against the United States founded either upon the Constitution, Congress or any regulation of an executive department or upon any express or implied contract (Exhibit P [Secret Service Webpage]) with the
- 3.) Pro se claimants must nonetheless "affirmatively and distinctly" plead that the court has subject matter jurisdiction. Norton v. Larney, 266 U.S. 511, 515, 45 S.Ct. 145, 69 L.Ed. 413 (1925) The court must accept as true the facts alleged in the complaint and draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the plaintiff. (See Henke v. United States, 60 F.3d 795,
- 4.)§ 1491(a)(2); James v. Caldera the injunctive relief has to be a collateral of the monetary damages. (In the request for relief section, money damage compensations for past harms are requested per the court rules and also injunctive relief request to prevent ongoing/future harms related to the claims alleged. This ties the injunctive relief directly to the monetary
- 5.) When evaluating subject matter jurisdiction, the court will accept the complaint's undisputed allegations as true and will construe the complaint in a manner favorable to the plaintiff. Coleman, 116 Fed. Cl.

At 468. Coleman v. United States, I 16 Fed. Cl. 461, 468 (2014)

- 6.) While this court has jurisdiction to hear a claim for money damages for unjust conviction, such jurisdiction is dependent on the challenged conviction first having been reversed, set aside, overturned, after a new trial or hearing or the prisoner having received a pardon. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1495, 2513(a)(1) (2012); see. E.s., Sharoe v. United States, 112 Fed. Cl. 468, 477 (2013). (Court Exhibit R.)
- 7.)2023 Amendment RCFC 5.5(d) **2023** Amendment RCFC 5.5(d) has been amended to eliminate the 2-copy requirement for any paper filing and the 4-copy requirement for any filing in a congressional reference case, as well as to clarify that a paper complaint must contain an original. (Court Exhibit Q). 'Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena Disclosure Act of 2023' Which states: All Federal Government records related to 5 unidentified anomalous phenomena should be preserved and centralized for historical and Federal Government purposes. Congress and the Air Force also testified.
- 8.)28 U.S.C. § 2508, Which gives the Court of Federal Claims jurisdiction over libel/defamation claims against the United States. This could apply to any defamation claims alleged. Created by the Federal Courts Improvement Act of 1982 (Pub. L. No. 97-164, 96 Stat. 25 (1982)
- 9.) Protective orders under RCFC 26(c). To enforce a clear nondiscretionary duty if the court finds the executive order creates one. William Jefferson Clinton, Petitioner, v. Paula Corbin Jones. (President Bush did request Judges to just interpret the law instead of to make them.) Millhiser, I. (2021).
- 10.) Rule 10(a) of the Rules of the United States Court of Federal Claims (RCFC) (2010); see also 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1) (2006); United States v. Sherwood, 312 U.S. 584, 587-88, 61 S.Ct. 767, 85 L.Ed. 1058 (1941) (regarding the jurisdiction of a predecessor court to the United States Court of Federal Claims, the United States Supreme Court stated, "if the relief sought is against others than the United States the suit as to them must be ignored as beyond the jurisdiction of the court."); Eskridge Research Corp. v. United States, 92 Fed.Cl. 88, 95 (2010) ("The United

States is the only *459proper defendant before the Court of Federal Claims.").

- 11.) Section 6226 of the Internal Revenue Code grants this court (Federal Court Of Claims) jurisdiction, along with the United States Tax Court and the United States district courts, to consider petitions for readjustment of partnership items as set forth in a final partnership administrative adjustment. Such as Dominion vs Fox. Under Lindsey v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo 2004-113, aff'd, 422 F.3d 684, 8th Circuit Court 2005 Which stated: "Regardless if it was personal or business."
- 12.) The Court of Federal Claims may certify questions to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1292(b), 1295. Or to transfer it to another Federal court that would have jurisdiction. See Gray v. United States, 69 Fed.Cl. 95, 102-03 (2005)
- 13.) I will have called the United States District Of Columbia Attorney Generals at time of filing to inform them of the lawsuit (They would then tell the Governor). I will also inform all the Department Heads of All The Federal Agencies involved (Such as the Post Masters at the Post Office, for example).
- 14.) The Judiciary Act to provide courts with jurisdiction in those cases that would help the nation avoid giving offense to foreign nations. (Chinese Civilian Spies)
- 15.) Constitutional claims 28 U.S.C. 2254, Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1986) and The Tucker Act applies to claims alleging violation of constitutional provisions that mandate payment of money **damages**, such as the 'Just Compensation Clause.'
- 16.) The U.S. Court Of Federal Claims has legal jurisdiction over my case because it's always usually against the United States Government.

Plaintiff: Mutaz Alshara

Defendant: The United States

Statement of Facts:

(It is here, solemnly sworn, under **impropria persona** or **pro se**) My **affidavit**, declared under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing **brief** is true, brought under good faith and correct; The sufficient fact(s) to support my Mutaz Alshara, 7737 Appoline Street, Dearborn, Michigan, 48126, 13134004945, Mutaz Alshara@ICloud.com or Mutaz Alshara@Outlook.com

complaint include the Department Of Homeland Security issuing out a national advisory stating that Gays in America are being targeted with terrorism. The Department Of Homeland Security then chose to deny my Civil Right forms. This concludes: 'The Department Of Homeland Security' while still based on their part of observation or testimony continued to fail at investigating a Gay Civil Rights matter which I reported to them. Meaning that: 'Shoba Wadhias' inactions were wrongful and that this is a lawsuit: The United States Government failed to perform a legal duty which resulted in harm to me (The Plaintiff). The incident took place 10 months ago. counting from when the national advisory first started. Under 5 U.S.C. § 552a(g)(5) it states that the bar of any statue of limitations is within two years unless an agency misrepresented. They failed to uphold the law. They've even told me to: 'Suicide Bomb' and all of it forwarded to the Government was still not investigated or looked into. Exhibit B, C and G could further conclude that none of this could've been considered hearsay (With all the video physical evidence in consideration too). I was told by an African-American female entity that I was getting "Whacked." On the phone with Takoma Park University! Including with the Federal Military Service Academy and the: 'Above-Top-Secret-Clearance.' I made another report to the University Of Michigans Civil Rights Office to investigate the matter where I held a Student Attorney membership there and their office also denied my complaint and wouldn't call to investigate or look into it further. I was also told to: "Suicide Bomb." I was even in fact shot by an Unidentified Flying Object (Court Exhibit Q in the Physical Evidence [UFO Military Fighter Defense]) Where the incident took place was in multiple locations which I reported to them. I will present the physical evidence such as photographs, letters, emails, medical records, videos, court reports and give statements in the oral argument. Deposition is against the United States ultimately if it's more than one branch as allowed in: § 1495. Damages for unjust conviction and imprisonment; Claim against United States: The United States Claims Court shall have jurisdiction to render judgment upon any claim for damages by any person unjustly convicted of an offense against the United States and imprisoned (The fact that Georgia even has the death penalty for capital crimes [Crimes which I did not commit!]). Which allows the jurisdiction of the court to resolve the legal dispute. My **pleadings** are: An invasion of my Fourteenth Amendments (Property rights), conversion, interference with economic interests, tortious interference with contractual relations, purely personal interests, defendant acted recklessly, with malice or deceit or in a manner that justifies penalizing their wrongdoing to

make an example to others. They placed me in multiple insane asylums while vacationing targeting me for being Gay with organized terrorism. It was a municipal county for the Federal Government Contractor which put me in there and a City Police Officer after said Fourteenth Amendment Violations. They also gave me a bunch of death threats and were being extremely demeaning. Upon my release from the mental institutions, I was sent to my car, tazed and placed in Federal confinement even after. I can just remember recalling: "Oh, the pain.. Oh the Agony!" But then the Federal Correctional Officers took photos of me nude. It's a United States Victim Of Prison Rape Act. Same as Abu Ghraib. United States vs U.S. Army (There were Uniformed Servicemembers there). The fact that I reported on kidnappings and them claiming to have 'Above-Top-Secret-Clearance' is unacceptable. Just for the record, aside from what they did my school has a gun range and they told me to shoot up schools. Also, I contacted 'cpnireporting.gov' (Cellular Service tower watch by the Secret Service.) They wouldn't respond either. I even sent it to the admin for the Secret Service (Exhibit P) which shows I sent it to numerous Government agencies and Military officials regarding my reports for someone to investigate. I will add July's Air Force Whistleblower testimony with the Congressional Action references and testimonies on it.

- 1. I suffered weight gain, fear for ones belongings and infringement of my civil rights as a result of the agencies' failure to properly investigate.
- 2. On November 30th, 2022, the Department of Homeland Security gave a national advisory issue that Gays in America are being targeted with acts of terrorism. They then extended it an additional six months on May 24th.
- 3. Immediately after, I submitted civil rights complaints (Which weren't EEO) to the following agencies reporting said terrorism or organized terrorism and violence targeting me based on my sexual orientation:
- Department of Homeland Security Civil Rights Office
- Internal Revenue Service Civil Rights Office
- Department of Education Civil Rights Office
- Department of Justice Civil Rights Office
- Federal Aviation Administration Civil Rights Office
- · Air Force Information Warfare Center
- National Security Council
- · University Of Michigan Civil Rights Office

- Takoma Parks Civil Rights Office, Madisons, Los Angeles's, San Franciscos and Berkeleys. (By not filing, I would've failed to fulfill a social equity, ethical corporate responsibilities and civic duties.)
- 3. All of the above civil rights offices denied my complaints and failed to investigate or take action, despite the DHS advisory indicating a credible threat to Gays.
- 4. The United States Government also issued in their observation and testimony (Exhibit G) that the following countries kill Gay populations:

Iran Saudi Arabia Yemen Nigeria Somalia Mauritania United Arab Emirates (Dubai) Qatar Pakistan Afghanistan

Statement Of Facts

The Plaintiff alleges being struck by an unidentified flying object or UFO in the United States. This incident is supported by physical evidence in the court exhibits found under 'Exhibit Q.' Testimonials, hearings before the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Subcommittee on Counterterrorism, Counterintelligence and Counterproliferation on May 17th, 2022, which the Homeland Security Oversight Committee on ethics, a woman named 'April' claiming to work for Senator Gary Peters also failed to investigate after being made aware in October, 2023 (And Congressional Reference or Action on July 13th, 2023 [Attached Court Exhibits]). According to the hearing transcript, retired Air Force Major David Grusch testified that he and other citizens observed what appeared to be "UAPs" There is also physical video evidence in Court Exhibit 'N.' This supports the plausibility of the plaintiff's reported being struck by an unidentified flying object during the same time period. Overall, the hearing transcript provides contemporaneous evidence that unidentified and unexplained military fighter defense grade aircrafts were observed around the time the plaintiff alleges being impacted by one domestically. It's also been more of the Government thinking it's okay to just ignore Delta Guantanamo Bay abuse reports or being treated as a Prisoner Of War such as the Hanoi Hilton Campsite with zero to no investigation including them telling me to Suicide Bomb and treating me as if it's 'Abu Ghraib;' A pro se plaintiff is held to a

Mutaz Alshara, 7737 Appoline Street, Dearborn, Michigan, 48126, 13134004945, Mutaz Alshara @ ICloud.com or Mutaz Alshara @ Outlook.com

less stringent standard than that of a plaintiff represented by an attorney. Riles, 93 Fe. Cl. At 165. (Citing Hughes v. Rowe, 449 U.S. 5, 9 (1980) and Taylor v. United States, 303F.3d 1357, 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002). None of it could even be considered hearsay with all the court exhibits either.

Mr. President vetoed Executive Order 13780: 'Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States' meaning those countries are now again eligible to enter the United States (Except Iran). The prerogative of Mr. President; The only issues presented here are whether the President was acting within the scope of his authority when he signed the Agreement and, if so, whether the agreement means what it says. For the reasons discussed above, both questions must be answered in an affirmative. Coplin v. United States, 6 Cl. Ct. 115 (Ct. Cl. 1984) William Jefferson Clinton, Petitioner, v. Paula Corbin Jones.

Claims:

The Department Of Justice (Crt-lgbtgi) Civil Right Offices, The Department Of Homeland Security (Not EEO), The Dearborn Police, The IRS, TIGTA, the Department Of Education, I informed the National Security Councils Undersecretary, the Air Force Information Warfare Center, wrote letter(s) to Mr. President (It technically goes through the National Security Councils undersecretary and only ones that are worthy go up to the Joint Chief Of Staff General and then escalated up in Government to the President) and just about every agency out there in terms of Civil Rights offices such as: Takoma Parks, Madisons, Berkeleys, Los Angeles and San Franciscos. It was even delivered to the FAAs Military Civil Rights office and the Federal Aviation Administrations Civilian Civil Rights Office (Including the University Of Michigans Civil Rights team), The Federal Civilian Government Oversight Contract Committee and I even contacted the Uinted States Civil Rights Commission because I couldn't get the Michigan Civil Rights office on the phone after several months of attempting to do so. It violated my:

- 1.) Gay Civil Rights (Found at Executive Order: 14075, 13988, 13672) Including Obergefell Versus Hodges.
- 2.) First, Fifth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments (Property Rights).
- 3.) Failed to investigate 'FAA Reauthorization Act Of 2018' under: 'Preventing Emerging Threats' of an Unidentified Flying Object which shot me when I had the sunroof open with a license plate that said: 'Drone2.'

4.) 28 U.S.C. § 2508

Robinson v. Commissioner, 102 T.C. 116, 122 (1994), aff'd in part and remanded, 70 F.3d, aff'd in part and remanded, 70 F.3d 34 (5th Circuit 1995) Kightlinger v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 1998-357. In Robinson, the Court incorporated the parties allocation of damages in its judgement by reference to their settlement agreement. However, the Service successfully argued that the allocation was not a "Bona fide allocation that was reached at arms length." Robinson, 102 T.C.at 133. Although, both of these cases are pre 1996 Amendment cases, they show how in cases where there was not an impartial and objective determination of the allocation of the award to its components, a reconsideration of the allocation is warranted. Bagley v. Commissioner, 105 T.C. 396 (1995), aff'd, 121 F.3d 393 (8th Circuit 1997); Robinson v. Commissioner, 102 T.C. 116, 122 (1994), aff'd in part and remanded, 70 F.3d 34 (5th Circuit 1995). Phoenix Coal Company, Incorporated v. Commissioner, 231 F.2d 420 (2nd Circuit 1956) The Court in LeFleur V. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 1997-312, a pre 1996 Amendment case, addressed the reallocation issue in a case involving claims for breach of contract, emotional distress (pain and suffering) and punitive damages. In an out-of-court settlement, the parties expressly agreed to allocate \$800,000 of the \$1 Million sum to personal injuries, \$200,000 to contract and none to punitive damages. The taxpayers included the \$200,000 of settlement proceeds allocated to the contract claim in their gross income on Schedule C and excluded the \$800,000 allocated to the personal injury under IRC § 104 (a)(2). Threlkeld v. Commissioner, 87 T.C. 1294, 1300, 1986 WL 22061 (1986) Allocating anything less than a million dollars would be unethical because it has to get reported to Congress about the case (Which is over a million dollars being the requirement). Cases are referenced for tax purposes under the Judges jurisdiction found 10.) Section 6226 of the Internal Revenue Code grants this court (Federal Court Of Claims) jurisdiction.

1.) **28 U.S.C. § 2508** Suit Code 320 for Libel Defamation would've applied to Dominion, a Big Government Contractor. Dominion vs Fox Mutaz Alshara, 7737 Appoline Street, Dearborn, Michigan, 48126, 13134004945, Mutaz Alshara © ICloud.com or Mutaz Alshara © Outlook.com

(\$787,000,000 If not granted, the Special Master will determine whether that was fair or just in the Plaintiffs written appeal to him). Under Lindsey v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo 2004-113, aff'd, 422 F.3d 684, 8th Circuit Court 2005 Which stated: "Regardless if it was personal or business."

- 2.) Punitive because they were the defendant acted knowingly, willingly, deliberately, recklessly and fraudulently.
- 3.) Negligent Tort 28 U.S.C. § 2508 (In The Federal Court Of Claims)

Claims: List your legal claims.

- This is the section in which you allege that the defendant violated laws or legal obligations that entitle you to monetary relief. You must identify the source of

that law or legal obligation.

My legal claims are that the Defendant violated the Plaintiff's civil rights on the basis of sexual orientation violating Executive Order: 14075, 13988, 13672 and Obergefell versus Hodges and failed to properly investigate credible threats targeting Gay individuals after the testimony and observation of the United States by the: to the Department Of Justice (Crtlgbtgi), Civil Right Offices, The Department Of Homeland Securities, The Dearborn Police, The IRS Civil Rights Office, the Department Of Educations Civil Rights (Which makes it ironic), I informed the National Security Councils Undersecretary, the Air Force Information Warfare Center, wrote a letter to Mr. President and just about every agency out there in terms of Civil Rights offices such as: Takoma Parks, Madisons, Berkeleys, Los Angeles and San Franciscos. None of them complied or had an Attorney General send out a U.S. Trustee or Private U.S. Trustee to investigate including all the Attorney Generals offices even though they're all public servants. It was even delivered to the FAAs Military Civil Rights office and the Federal Aviation Administrations Civilian Civil Rights Office (Including the University Of Michigans Civil Rights team [Where I had a student attorney membership. Not EEO. Plaintiff further alleges being struck and injured by an unidentified flying object within the United States. Mutaz Alshara versus United States is a Civil Rights Matter violation and not an EEO Case. The defendant violated laws or legal obligations that entitle me to monetary belief by ignoring the Gay National Advisory (As shown in the physical evidence to the judge in Court Exhibit A) stating Gays (Based on the testimony and observation of the United States

Government) in America Gays are being targeted with terrorism and the Big Government chose to not investigate. It goes against Executive Order: 14075, 13988, 13672 and Obergefell versus Hodges. In fact, their Attorney General even said that she was going to wait to hear back from the trial courts instead of sending out a U.S. Trustee or Private U.S. Trustee to investigate from the Treasury. I even explained that it happened in Georgia, Florida, Ann Arbor, Dearborn and Denver. I'm waiting for my oral statements. Also, Takoma Park University calling me saying they were going to whack me is uncalled for and then all the saved unknown numbers from Michigan. Ann Arbor had already given me a response and said they weren't able to investigate either. Nor the University Of Michigans Civil Rights Office. It's so much broader than just the school. Also, all the Fourteenth Amendment (Property Right) Violations, Arrests and Mental Institutions was uncalled for. Meaning 28 U.S.C. § 149I(a) would not entertain attacks on other Federal Courts because the Judges and Doctors deemed me competent that year] See 28 U.S.C. § 149I(a); Shinnecock India Nation v. United States, 782 F.3d 1345, 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2015) ("Binding precedent establishes that the Court of Federal Claims has no jurisdiction to review the merits of a decision rendered by a federal district court."); Vereda, Ltda. v. United States, 271F.3d1367, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2001) ("The Court of Federal Claims cannot entertain a taking claim that requires the court to scrutinize the actions of another tribunal." I am seeking keen and quality financial compensation such as: punitive exemplary damages due to infringement of my Civil Rights and Liberties caused by the negligent behavior of the United States Government.

1.) The solution is that I get a Government that is willing to represent. The wrongs committed by the defendant is that I got hit with a drone stateside sent in evidence, which they ignored, so not hearsay. The defendant allowed Sha'ria Law and a De Facto Criminalization State to happen. I produced photo evidence confirming that I was being targeted with organized terrorism in America for being Gay. The United States Government then confirms the same fact finding from their discovery except denies all of my Gay Civil Right claims. The fact of the matter is: Gays in America are being targeted with terrorism (According to their national advisory: "). The United States Government confirmed organized terrorism targeting Gays except denies my Civil Rights claim. I then filed

multiple Civil Right forms with different Federal Agencies such as the Department Of Homeland Securities Civil Rights Office (Which issued the national advisory stating Gays in America are being targeted with terrorism) and they denied all of my Civil Right claims during the national advisory. Their Civil Rights office (Including the Internal Revenue Service Civil Rights [Which also partook involvement], The Department Of Educations, The Department Of Justice, The FAA Civilian Civil Rights Director, the FAA Military Civil Rights Director, the Air Force Information Warfare Center, The University Of Michigans Civil Rights Office) misconduct goes against executive order: 14075 regardless of William Jefferson Clinton, Petitioner, v. Paula Corbin Jones. I also sent it to the Department Of Justices Civil Rights Office (Crt-lgbtqi@usdoj.gov) and they denied it too. I sent it to FBI offices and every Civil Rights office in the country has denied the form. Michigans Attorney General said she was going to wait to hear back from the court trial instead of going through the Civil Rights Office! In **B.P.J vs West Virginia**, 16 California Attorney Generals represented BP.J. Prior to these events having conspired. United States Federal Judges, Forensics and Doctors cleared me and said that I was competent to stand trial. Supreme Court ruled in ALI, Model Penal Code §223.2(1), pp. 162, 168 (1980) (Supreme Court Library) (Also, if the judge will accept Exhibit 'L') that as long as I understood the law then I am deemed competent (Which Exhibit 'L' already clears me as competent and sane to stand trial [Meaning] 28 U.S.C. § 149I(a) would not entertain attacks on other Federal Courts because the Judges and Doctors deemed me competent that year] See 28 U.S.C. § 149I(a); Shinnecock India Nation v. United States, 782 F.3d 1345, 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2015) ("Binding precedent establishes that the Court of Federal Claims has no jurisdiction to review the merits of a decision rendere by a federal district court."); Vereda, Ltda. v. United States, 271F.3d1367, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2001) ("[T]he Court of Federal Claims cannot entertain a taking claim that requires the court to scrutinize the actions of another tribunal." I am seeking keen and quality financial compensation such as: punitive exemplary damages due to infringement of my Civil Rights and Liberties caused by the negligent behavior of the United States

Government. Title 10 and Title 50 get revoked from the FBI and gets given to the military when it's not considered a hate crime but instead terrorism by the Department of homeland security. The Department Of Homeland Security is in charge of the FBI and the military because of a checks and balances. The Department of Defense often argue with the FBI because it's out of the FBIs jurisdiction. Pentagon lawyers argue it might be an issue (Issue meaning: Send it out officially, have it court ordered). It was also a Fourteenth Amendment Violation (Property Rights)

B. War Crimes

The complaint alleges war crimes in the form of murder against the civilian population.

1. The prohibition against war crimes is a specific, universal, and obligatory internationally accepted norm.

War crimes are defined primarily by the Geneva Conventions, to which the United States, along with at least 180 nations, *764 is a party and which constitute part of customary international law. See, e.g., Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, S. Exec. Rep. 101-30, at 15 (1990) ("[T]he Geneva Conventions, to which the United States and virtually all other countries are Parties, . . . generally reflect customary international law."). War crimes are also among the crimes of "universal concern" in Restatement (Third), § 404.

War crimes, regrettably, continue to have an all too contemporary resonance. A district court in Virginia has recently recognized the status of war crimes as sufficiently specific, obligatory, and universal to give rise to a cause of action under the ATS:

Claims for violations of the international norm proscribing war crimes are cognizable under the ATS. By ratifying the Geneva Conventions, Congress has adopted a precise, universally accepted definition of war crimes. Moreover, through enactment of a separate federal statute, Congress has incorporated this precise definition into the federal criminal law. 18 U.S.C. § 2441. Thus, Congress has clearly defined the law of nations to include a

binding prohibition on the commission of war crimes. Given this, and given Sosa's teachings, it follows that an allegation of a war crime states a cause of action under the ATS.

In re Xe Servs. Alien Tort Litig., 665 F.Supp.2d 569, 582 (E.D.Va.2009).

The definition of war crimes found in Common Article III has been agreed to by the United States and more than 180 nations party to the Geneva Convention. Common Article III provides, in relevant part:

In the case of armed conflict not of an international character occurring in the territory of one of the High Contracting Parties, each Party to the conflict shall be bound to apply, as a minimum, the following provisions:

(1) Persons taking no active part in the hostilities . . . shall in all circumstances be treated humanely, without any adverse distinction founded on race, color....

To this end, the following acts are and shall remain prohibited at any time and in any place whatsoever with respect to the above-mentioned persons:

(a) violence to life and person, in particular murder of all kinds, mutilation, cruel treatment and torture. . . .

Fourth Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, art. 3, Oct. 21, 1950, 75 U.N.T.S. 287 (Geneva IV). Like the provisions in international law defining genocide, this definition is sufficiently specific, obligatory and universal to give rise to an ATS claim. Defendants do not contend otherwise.

Request for Relief: Explain what you would like the court to do.

5. RELIEF. Briefly state exactly what you want the court to do for you.

And since 'Amendment' means only to 'Amend' Men I think that the women being reported should also be investigated by the U.S. Trustee or a Private U.S. Trustee ordered by the Attorney General in court.

My requests are for a writ of memorandum awarding compensation. I will seek relief of damages being equitable (Only Honorable Judges in equitable cases mostly) because I got hit with an Unidentified Flying Object (UFO [Meaning a Military Plane but no country has come forward to claim it]) in the United States Of America sent in evidence so not hearsay: Keen and quality financial compensation such as punitive and exemplary damages due to infringement of said Civil Rights and Liberties by the negligent behavior of the United States Government. Dominion Vs Fox was ruled in a Federal Court room for \$787,000,000 which is what I'm requesting along with such other relief that the Court deems just and equitable. If not granted, the Special Master will determine whether that was fair or just in the Plaintiffs written appeal to him), Under Lindsey v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo 2004-113, aff'd, 422 F.3d 684, 8th Circuit Court 2005 Which states: "Regardless if it was personal or business." Also, I don't want to ever accept anything less than: \$10,400,280.32 (There's a 30% IRS Tax Deduction) to begin with since it has to get reported to Congress if it's anything over a million dollars anyway (Which they should be made aware since there's a Congressional Action reference physical involved court exhibits with and evidence.)

Also, the Secret Service said if the President signs an executive order, we'll protect you (It was answered under 'Frequently Asked Questions.') The executive order created an implied-in-fact **contract** between the Gays under E.O. 14075 and the Secret Service to provide protective services. The failure to receive equal protection through Secret Service coverage as directed by Mr. President implies insubordination. Which ties to the monetary damages because of the Chinese Civilian Spies stalking from Court Exhibit 'J.' I will request a **writ** of mandamus under Executive Order: 14075, 13988, 13672 and Obergefell v. Hodges creating an implied obligation on the Secret Service providing protections to myself. Failure to do so was an abrogation of their lawful obligation under Mr. Presidents order.

I'm requesting Kania v. United States, 227 Ct.Cl. 458, 650 F.2d 264, 268 (1981) and Sanders v. United States, 252 F.3d 1329, 1335 (Fed.Cir.2001) if it gets approved also some sort of restraining order against the Chinese Civilian Spies. Mr. President signed Gay protection in: 14075. I will request the court to uphold that since I'm Gay regardless of William Jefferson CLINTON, Petitioner, v. Paula Corbin JONES. I will choose my Secret Service if the court affirms it. Plus, I had Chinese Civilian

Spies show up in my backyard. Supreme **Court** has allowed alternative dispute resolution under **case law: Tanzin v. Tanvir, 592 U.S. (2020)** Probably for **Pretrial Conference** or arbitration. Except, I will not accept a **summary judgement** because justice would still need to be upheld (Plus the IRS has a form for lawsuits asking: 'Why did you settle?'. [I think it's really cool though that in Court Trials, someone from the Treasury investigates the Government called a U.S. Trustee or Private U.S. Trustee to handle the case.])

I'm being tasked with contacting the U.S. Marshalls and every attorney general in District Of Columbia, probably to not result in: 'Default Judgement.' Including every department agency head being sued. I'm seeking impeachment of all the high officer Federal Government employees involved because of their misconduct (Meaning the judge or government attorney would have to admit to information [Information means a Government employee committed a misdemeanor or felony]) by the House of Representatives. I'm also seeking an injunction on Government Contractors aside from Secret Service or U.S. Marshalls (Since they're my **Service Of Process** serving summoning **subpoenas**) constantly stalking me or placing me in the Ku Klux Klan hospitals. The interrogatories would be really easy against the defendant with the evidence. If Jury all jurors are to be sequestered. Order a Private U.S. Trustee to look into the matter of Dubai purchasing McAfee Anti-Virus products for \$16,000,000,000 (16 Billion Dollars) which are installed on Court Computers meaning they could download backdoors which aren't hardware or software patchable (Because of the Department Of Treasury and the National Health Institute) by the District Of Columbia Attorney General. Which I will ask the Courts to not Suppress my statements because Dubai (United Arab Emirates) practices Sha'ria Law 9Which is the beheadings of Gays.) I think it's extremely diabolical what they're doing. It's Genocide and can't be counted for or as 'Diplomatic Immunity.'

I will list the majority opinions (Binding Precedent) to have the court rule:

Tanzin v. Tanvir, 592 U.S. (2020)

William Jefferson CLINTON, Petitioner, v. Paula Corbin JONES to reenact Executive Order 13780, 13769: 'Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States' as recently granted by the Supreme Court to allow any Federal Judge to do so in the majority opinion held in: 19-783 Van Buren V. United States (06/03/2021). I will also request Mutaz Alshara, 7737 Appoline Street, Dearborn, Michigan, 48126, 13134004945,

Mutaz Alshara, 7/37 Appoline Street, Dearborn, Michigan, 48126, 13134004945 MutazAlshara@ICloud.com or MutazAlshara@Outlook.com

to add all the countries advised by the United States Government in 'Exhibit G' which includes Saudi Arabia because no Amendments seem to have been implemented. There's no way it's a bunch of Females and African-Americans robbing with a Caucasian male too violating Fourteenth Amendment Violations claiming 'Above-Top-Secret-Clearance,' would deny injunctive reliefs with respect to embracing Justice Cardozo's notion that errors "violat[ing] those `fundamental principles of liberty and justice which lie at the base of all our civil and political institutions," Palko v. Connecticut, 302 U.S. 319, 328 (1937 [How would that would work since we're citing Gay rights in 1937. Only Gay conservatives at the time got away]) (quoting Hebert *321 v. Louisiana, 272 U.S. 312, 316 (1926), must be rectified, Justice Harlan expressly rejected a previous statement linking the fundamental fairness exception to factual innocence. Mackey, supra, at 694; see Desist, supra, at 262. Snyder v. Massachusetts, supra, p. 105; Brown v. Mississippi, supra, p. 285; Hebert v. Louisiana, 272 U.S. 312, 316. I have to file a 'Top Secret' Federal Court Of Claims form.

Including that which aren't currently in effect from this list:

https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/trump-campaign-press-release-nothing-be-proud-the-biden-lgbt-record

(Except the H-I-V Visa Ban. It should stay in place because it's denialism to say it's not from saliva or a virus from Haiti and West Africa eating a form of Chimpanzee.)

Obergefell, Et Al. V. Hodges, Et Al. (S. Ct.) Amicus Brief 03/06/2015

United States V. City Of Albuquerque (D.N.M.) Settlement Agreement 11/14/2014

Burnett V. City Of Philadelphia-Free Library (E.D. Pa.) Statement Of Interest 04/04/2014

South Carolina Department Of Corrections (D.S.C.) Complaint 09/30/2013 Consent 10/01/2013 07/24/2013 Resolution Agreement 07/24/2013

Investigation Of The New Orleans Police Department(E.D.La.) Findings Report State Correctional Institution At Pittsburgh (W.D.Pa.) Closing Letter 01/08/2013

Pratt V. Indian River Central School District (N.D.N.Y.) Amicus Brief 08/13/2010

Collins v. Jones

Boston v American Military University (Boston said the University targeted students)